1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	JAMES A. OLIFF ( <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> ) JOHN W. O'MEARA ( <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> ), WILLIAM J. UTERMOHLEN ( <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> ) OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC 277 South Washington St., Suite 500 Alexandria, Virginia 22314 Tel: (703) 836-6400; Fax: (703) 836-2787 e-mails: joliff@oliff.com, jomeara@oliff.com wutermohlen@oliff.com  SUSAN VAN KEULEN CA Bar No. 136060, svankeulen@thelen.com CHRISTOPHER L. OGDEN CA Bar No. 235517, cogden@thelen.com THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER, LLP 225 West Santa Clara Street, Suite 1200 San Jose, CA 95113 Tel: (408) 292-5800; Fax (408) 287-8040  Attorneys for Seiko Epson Corporation, Epso	CA Bar No. 184963 erader@akingump.com AKIN, GUMP, STRAUSS, HAUER & FELD LLP Two Palo Alto Square 3000 El Camino Real, Suite 400 Palo Alto, CA 94306 Telephone: (650) 838-2000; Fax: (650) 838-2001  Attorneys for Coretronic Corporation and Optoma Technology, Inc.
12 13	Research and Development, Inc. and Epson America, Inc.	•
14	LINITED STATES DISTRICT COLIDT	
15	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
16	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
17	SEIKO EPSON CORPORATION,	
18	Plaintiff,	Case Nos. C 06-6946, 07-6055 MHP
19	v. )	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
20	CORETRONIC CORPORATION and OPTOMA TECHNOLOGY, INC.,	DISMISSING CLAIMS RELATING TO U.S. PATENT NOS. 6,402,324 & 6,644,817
21 22	Defendants.	
23	AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS	
24		
25		("SEC") asserted in this case that Coretronic
26	Corporation ("Coretronic") and Optoma Tech	nology, Inc. ("Optoma") infringed U.S. Patent No.
!	C 100 001 (W1 001 B :	NT 6 6 6 4 0 1 7 (4 4 1 0 1 7 P 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
27 28	6,402,324 ("the 324 Patent") and U.S. Patent	No. 6,664,817 ("the 817 Patent"); and

1	WHEREAS Coretronic and Optoma hav	ve denied infringing the 324 and 817 Patents and have
2	asserted counterclaims for declaratory judgmen	t that those patents are invalid; and
3	WHEREAS SEC has indicated its intent	to withdraw its infringement assertions as to the 324
4	and 817 Patents in this case; and	
5	WHEREAS the parties agree that in ligh	nt of such withdrawal, the issue of the 324 and 817
6	Patents' validity need not be litigated and resolv	red at this time;
7	NOW, THEREFORE, THE PARTIES S'	TIPULATE AND ASK THE COURT FOR AN
8	ORDER AS FOLLOWS:	
9	Dismissing without prejudice SEC's asso	ertion of infringement of the 324 and 817 Patents
10	against Coretronic and Optoma and dismissing	without prejudice Coretronic's and Optoma's
11	declaratory judgment actions seeking a declarat	ion regarding the invalidity of the 324 and 817
12	patents.	
13	DATED: July, 2008	
14		Respectfully submitted,
15   16   17   18   19   20   21   22   23   24   25   26	Yitai Hu (CA Bar No. 248085) Elizabeth H. Rader (CA Bar No. 184963) AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP 2 Palo Alto Square 3000 El Camino Real, Suite 400 Palo Alto, California 94306 Telephone: (650) 838-2000 Facsimile: (650) 838-2001 Attorneys for Coretronic Corporation	James A. Oliff (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) John W. O'Meara (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) William J. Utermohlen (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC 277 South Washington Street, Suite 500 Alexandria, VA 22314 Telephone: 703-836-6400 Facsimile: 703-836-2787  Susan van Keulen (CA Bar No. 136060) Christopher L. Ogden (CA Bar No. 235517) THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP 225 West Santa Clara Street, Suite 1200 San Jose, CA 95113 Telephone: (408) 292-5800 Facsimile: (408) 287-8040  Attorneys for Seiko Epson Corporation, Epson Research & Development Corporation and Epson America, Inc.
27		
27   28		

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

28

Pursuant to General Order No. 45, Section X(B) regarding signatures, I attest under penalty of perjury that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from Elizabeth H. Rader.

Dated: July \_\_\_, 2008

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP

By: /s/ Christopher L. Ogden, Esq. (State Bar No. 235517)

Attorneys for Seiko Epson Corporation

Having considered the parties' statements and stipulations set forth above, and good cause appearing therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

SEC's claims of infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,402,324 and U.S. Patent No. 6,664,817 against Coretronic and Optoma and Coretronic's and Optoma's declaratory judgment actions seeking a declaration regarding the invalidity of the 324 and 817 patents are DISMISSED without prejudice.

Dated: July 14\_\_\_\_\_, 2008

